



UNITED STATE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Offic

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

MV

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR		ATT	ORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/715,8	69 09/19/	96 HEPPLER		S	2972US (92-04
_		PM82/050	79	EXA	AMINER
JOSEPH A WALKOWSKI				NGUYEN,T	
	ITT & ROSSA	1		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
P O BOX SALT LAK	2550 E CITY UT 8	34110		3653	24
				DATE MAILED:	05/09/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

			
	Application No. Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary	08/71S 869 Examiner	Steve Heppler Group Art Urlit	
	Tuan 1	January 3653	
—The MAILING DATE of this communication app		beneath the correspondence address	
P ri d for Response			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE I MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	S SET TO EXPIRE Three	2 (3) MONTH(S) FROM THE	
 Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for response specified above is less than thirty (30) d If NO period for response is specified above, such period shall, by Failure to respond within the set or extended period for response 	ays, a response within the statu default, expire SIX (6) MONTH	ntory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered time.	
Status			
Responsive to communication(s) filed on	4/16/0	<u> </u>	
☐ This action is FINAL.	, ,		
 Since this application is in condition for allowance exc accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 			
Disp sition of Claims			
\times Claim(s) 1-13, 16, 19, 2	2 25-27 and 2	29-31 is/are pending in the application.	
Of the above claim(s)		is/are withdrawn from consideration	
\times Claim(s) 1-6, 13, 16, 19, 2	2,27 and 31	is/are allowed.	
(12, 25, 26)	is/are rejected.		
□ Claim(s)	is/are objected to.		
□ Claim(s)		are subject to restriction or election	
		requirement.	
Application Papers	uing Bouious BTO 049		
☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Dra ★ The proposed drawing correction, filed on 00.8		□ disapproved	
☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are ob	•		
☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.	, ,		
☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	г.		
☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	r.		
	y under 35 U.S.C. § 11 9(a of the priority documents i	have been	
 □ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Pri rity under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d) □ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority □ All □ Some* □ None of the CERTIFIED copies □ received. □ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Numbers) 	y under 35 U.S.C. § 11 9(a of the priority documents mber) International Bureau (PCT	have been Rule 1 7.2(a)).	
 □ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Pri rity under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d) □ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority □ All □ Some* □ None of the CERTIFIED copies □ received. □ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Nut □ received in this national stage application from the *Certified copies not received: 	y under 35 U.S.C. § 11 9(a of the priority documents mber) International Bureau (PCT	have been Rule 1 7.2(a)).	
 □ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Pri rity under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d) □ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority □ All □ Some* □ None of the CERTIFIED copies □ received. □ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number of the Certain Number of the	y under 35 U.S.C. § 11 9(a of the priority documents i mber) International Bureau (PCT	have been Rule 1 7.2(a)).	
☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Pri rity under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies ☐ received. ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Nur ☐ received in this national stage application from the *Certified copies not received: Attachment(s)	y under 35 U.S.C. § 11 9(a of the priority documents mber)	Rule 1 7.2(a)).	

U. S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-326 (Rev. 3-97)

*U.S. GPO: 1997-417-381/62710 Part of Paper No._____

Application/Control Number: 08/715,869

Art Unit: 3653

DETAILED ACTION

After firther reconsideration, the final rejection mailed on December 15, 2001 (paper no.
 is hereby withdrawn.

2. Claims 7-12, 25, 26, 29 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 251 as being improperly broadened in a reissue application made and sworn to by the assignee and not the patentee.

Applicant had admitted in the declaration that independent claims 7, 10, 25 and 29 are broadened from the patented claims 1-6 in Patent No. 5,348,164.

Claims 7-12, 25, 26, 29 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 251 as being an improper recapture of broadened claimed subject matter surrendered in the application for the patent upon which the present reissue is based. See *Hester Industries, Inc.* v. *Stein, Inc.*, 142 F.3d 1472, 46 USPQ2d 1641 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Clement*, 131 F.3d 1464, 45 USPQ2d 1161 (Fed. Cir. 1997); *Ball Corp.* v. *United States*, 729 F.2d 1429, 1436, 221 USPQ 289, 295 (Fed. Cir. 1984). A broadening aspect is present in the reissue which was not present in the application for patent. The record of the application for the patent shows that the broadening aspect (in the reissue) relates to subject matter that applicant previously surrendered during the prosecution of the application. Accordingly, the narrow scope of the claims in the patent was not an error within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 251, and the broader scope surrendered in the application for the patent cannot be recaptured by the filing of the present reissue application.

Page 3 Application/Control Number: 08/715,869

Art Unit: 3653

The reasons for improper recapture are: In the reissue application, independent claims 7, 10, 25 and 29 do not include the allowable subject matters "a first track...." and "a second track....." as cited in independent claim 1 of Patent No. 5,348,164.

Claims 1-6, 13, 16, 19, 22, 27 and 31 are allowed. 3.

Applicant's arguments filed on April 16, 2001 have been fully considered but they are not 4. persuasive.

Responding to applicant's remarks, applicant has argued that independent claims 7 and 10 are narrower than independent claim 1 of Patent No. 5,348,164 (Patent'164). However, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Claims 7 and 10 do not further have limitations "a first track for receiving the integrated circuit from the holding station when the holding station is in the first test position" and "a second track for receiving the integrated circuit.........when said receiving means returns to said test position" as cited in paragraphs (d) and (e) of claim 1 in Patent'164. Regarding claims 25 and 29, "a first track" and "a second track" still lack further limitations as cited above.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Examiner Tuan Nguyen 5. at telephone number (703) 308-3664.

tnn,

May 04, 2001.

Evan Mguyen 5/4/01